

AMERICAN BROADCASTING COMPANY



8:30 p.m., E.W.T., AUGUST 23, 1945

Town Meeting



Bulletin OF AMERICA'S
TOWN MEETING OF THE AIR
Sponsored by THE READER'S DIGEST

Should We or an International Authority Control Strategic Bases in the Pacific?

Moderator, GEORGE V. DENNY, JR.

Speakers

WARREN G. MAGNUSON
EDOUARD IZAC

EVANS F. CARLSON
GEORGE E. OUTLAND

(See also page 12)

COMING SEPTEMBER 6th

Should Hollywood Make Movies Designed To Influence Public Opinion?

TUNE IN EVERY THURSDAY, AMERICAN BROADCASTING COMPANY—8:30 p.m., E.W.T.

★ ★ ★ CONTENTS ★ ★ ★

The account of the meeting reported in this Bulletin was transcribed from recordings made of the actual broadcast and represents the exact content of the meeting as nearly as such mechanism permits. The publishers and printer are not responsible for the statements of the speakers or the points of view presented.

THE BROADCAST OF AUGUST 23:

"Should We or an International Authority Control Strategic Bases in the Pacific?"

<i>Mr. DENNY</i>	3
<i>Congressman IZAC</i>	5
<i>Colonel CARLSON</i>	7
<i>Senator MAGNUSON</i>	9
<i>Congressman OUTLAND</i>	11
THE SPEAKERS' COLUMN	12
QUESTIONS, PLEASE!	15



THE BROADCAST OF AUGUST 30:

"How Can We Make Jobs for All Now?"



THE BROADCAST OF SEPTEMBER 6:

"Should Hollywood Make Movies Designed To Influence Public Opinion?"

The Broadcast of August 23, 1945, originated in the Lobero Theatre, Santa Barbara, California, from 8:30 to 9:30 p.m., Eastern War Time, over the American Broadcasting Company Network.

Town Meeting is published weekly by *The Reader's Digest*. Town Meeting Publication Office: 32 South Fourth St., Columbus 15, Ohio. Send subscriptions to Town Hall, 123 West 43rd St., New York 18, N.Y. Subscription price, \$4.50 a year, 10c a copy. Entered as second-class matter, May 9, 1942, at the Post Office at Columbus, Ohio, under the Act of March 3, 1897.



Town Meeting

Bulletin of America's Town Meeting of the Air



George V. Denny, Jr., Moderator

Should We or an International Authority Control Strategic Bases in the Pacific?

Announcer:

The Reader's Digest, America's most widely read magazine welcomes you to another thrilling session of America's Town Meeting, the program that gives both sides of issues effecting your life and mine. America's Town Meeting is sponsored by Town Hall of New York, and opinions expressed on this program are entirely those of the speakers.

Tonight, here in Lobero Theater in Santa Barbara, California, where we are the guests of the Lobero Theater Foundation and Station KTMS, four authorities clash on the question that may involve the protection of the United States from future aggression. Now to open this important discussion, *The Reader's Digest* brings you the president of Town Hall and moderator of America's Town Meeting, Mr. George V. Denny, Jr. Mr. Denny. (Applause.)

Moderator Denny:

Good evening, neighbors. America's Town Meeting is sponsored by *The Reader's Digest*, our announcer should have said. It's produced by Town Hall in New York. With that correction, we go on.

The answer to that question in your minds, friends, is "Yes." No, I'm not a mind reader, but nearly everybody I meet nowadays asks the question, "Aren't we going to be faced with more difficult problems now than during the war?"

The answer is "Yes." During the war we were united against a common enemy and all the resources of this Nation and more than 50 others were thrown unselfishly into the fight.

Now we are free again, free to make the right choices or the wrong ones, free to be selfish or unselfish, free to make ourselves worthy or unworthy of the position of leadership we have attained in the world. Among the first of

the problems of peace we must face is our future security in the Pacific. Who should control those strategic bases from which the Japs made their sneak attack on us at Pearl Harbor? This is one of the first questions we must answer.

Congressman Izac, chairman of a special subcommittee of the House Naval Affairs Committee charged with investigating this question has just returned from a 33,000-mile trip inspecting these islands with his committee. This Committee recommends that the United States claim full title to those Pacific islands where American bases are located.

Senator Warren Magnuson of Washington, a member of the Senate Naval Affairs Committee supports his view.

On the other hand, Congressman George Outland of Santa Barbara and Colonel Evans F. Carlson of the United States Marine Corps Reserve, gallant leader of Carlson's Raiders, believe that our security and world peace will be best preserved if these bases are controlled by an international authority.

The United Nations charter does include a chapter on trusteeship. Our speakers have asked me to read parts of Section B of this Charter applying to the question of trusteeship. I've summarized it here as best I can and here you are:

"The organization should establish under its authority an international trusteeship." The organization means the United Nations organization that was established by the San Francisco Charter which was signed by all the delegates there and has been adopted by our Senate. "The basic objectives of the trusteeship system, in accordance with the Purposes of the United Nations laid down in Article 1 of the present Charter, shall be: a. to further international peace and security; b. to promote the political, economic, social, and educational advancement" of the trust territories and their inhabitants, "and their progressive development toward self-government or independence, as may be appropriate . . .; c. to encourage respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, religion, and to encourage recognition of the interdependence of all peoples of the world."

It goes on to say that the trusteeship system should apply only to the following territories: "a. territories now held under mandate; b. territories which may be detached from enemy states as a result of the Second World War" such as those that are now under discussion particularly, the ones we are fighting from in the Pacific; "c. territories voluntarily placed under the system by states responsible for their administration."

It would be a matter of subsequent agreement as to which territories would be brought under the trustee system and under what terms. The whole thing is left open for negotiation.

There is an additional provision which seems to be important. "There may be designated, in any trusteeship agreement, a strategic area or areas which may include part or all of the trust territory to which the agreement applies," that is such as Okinawa—part of it could be under trusteeship and part of it not.

Next, all functions of the organization relative to such strategic areas, including the approval of the trusteeship arrangement and their alteration and amendment should be exercised by the Security Council of the United Nations—that is the central body composed of the 11 members—five permanent and six changing.

Another provision that seems to be important: It shall be the duty of the state administering any trust territory to insure that the territory shall play its part in the maintenance of the international peace and security.

Well, gentlemen, I'll bet you not very many people have read that before. Now we are pleased to present our first speaker, Congressman Ed. V. Izac of San Diego. Congressman Izac. (*Applause.*)

Congressman Izac:

Thank you, Mr. Denmy and my friends. He told you about our going on a 33,000-mile trip to see these bases that I'm going to talk about. I wish you could have gone with me, too. I think you would have expressed the same views I'm going to express, had you done so.

The great massed populations of the earth occupy the continent and the islands of Asia. While we prepare for a new era of peace, we cannot afford to disregard the lessons of recent history. We must safeguard our future as a Nation and a peaceful destiny we hope is ours.

Vital and almost fatal mistakes were made by our government leaders after the wars of 1898 and 1918. Perhaps public opinion was principally to blame.

Regardless of the progress made in creation of engines of war—the atomic bomb, let us say—the fact still remains that time and space have not been and probably never will be completely eliminated. Hence to that nation which can use the time and occupy the space available will go the initial advantage if war comes again.

The United States, by the expenditure of blood and lives, of energy and of money, has built a cordon of powerful bases in the far reaches of the Pacific which, together with the steppingstones of approach, made possible the vanquishing of our present foe—for-

merly, the supreme power of the Orient. Japan may try again, or a combination of Asiatic peoples may again disturb the peace of the world.

Our possession of the bases will mean a vigilant eye kept on whoever would disturb that peace. We could nip in the bud any incipient gesture toward war and as the bases lie athwart any and all paths that lead towards our western shores from across the Pacific, their occupation by us would mean the greatest degree of security to be attained through distance and through time.

In answer to the question, "Should we or an international authority control our strategic bases in the Pacific?" I must contend that the United States alone has the resources, the proximity, and the all-important national interest to provide for their proper development and use.

We alone, of all the Allied Nations, have a navy powerful enough to keep open the supply and communications lines to those bases. We alone have demonstrated our unselfish attitude towards territorial expansion, and we alone, of all the powers great and small, have the most perfect record of non-exploitation of native populations.

Knowing this, the three kings of the Marshall Islands, in a recent conversation, begged me to present their plea to the Congress of the United States for annexation. Pres-

ident Osmena of the Philippine Islands, stated to me that not a dissenting vote was cast in the Philippine Legislature when the offer was made to give the United States all the bases we deem necessary on their islands. Even the Okinawans seemed happy to leave the lands of their forefathers in southern Okinawa to be segregated in the northern end of the island, as we built the bases from which to operate against Japan. Why? Because they knew we came as liberators, not as exploiters.

An international authority would mean, in the end, the full burden of defense and control placed on the United States. It would naturally also mean, in addition to divided authority, divided allegiance. That would plant the seed for future trouble, as witness the condominium status of the New Hebrides Islands, where the British and the French exercise joint control and enjoying no allegiance and no loyalty.

Under our control of these bases, the natives of the Pacific will enjoy a full degree of liberty and be aided in the attainment of self-sufficiency, self-determination, and final self-government. Their attitude towards us, if trouble comes, will mean the difference in the treatment received from the Filipinos on one hand, whose guerrillas fought side by side with us against the common enemy, and on the other hand, the actions of the na-

tives of the Solomons who beheaded our stricken aviators as they reached the beaches of Guadalcanal.

Finally, with locations and distances so important in the vast extent of the Pacific, by our control of all the links in the enormous arched chain that stretches from the shores of Japan to New Caledonia, the United States alone, having possession of all the links, can preserve security not only of the United States but of the whole Western Hemisphere and can safeguard the peace of the Pacific.

A weak link in that chain held under an international authority would mean the weakness of the whole. It would mean our vulnerability to attack from the Orient.

I feel sure the correctness of this view will be recognized by the Allied Nations and, if realistically presented to them, will be accepted by them. Peace in our time and in our children's, depends on America's control of the Pacific isles. (*Applause.*)

Moderator Denny:

Thank you, Congressman Izac. But there's another man who is also familiar with those islands out in the Pacific—one of those gallant fighting marines, Colonel Evans F. Carlson, leader of the famous Carlson's Raiders, now of the United States Marine Corps Reserves, who is going to take issue with you. Colonel Carlson. (*Applause.*)

Colonel Carlson:

As I listened to Congressman Izac's argument, I was reminded of the humorously caustic remarks I have heard Marines make while we were in the process of charging the beaches and seizing some of the islands we are talking about. They ran something like this:

"We'll take this blankety-blank island and then give it back to the Indians. I don't want any part of it."

Like the thinking that a lot of people are doing now about the future controls of these islands, such remarks of the Marines and G I's who captured them were motivated by emotion rather than by common sense and reasoning.

Today, you and I stand at the most critical turning point in human history. We are the victors in a global war which has wrought destruction that beggars our imagination. The atomic bomb provides new destructive power that can obliterate mankind unless people muster the intelligence and the will to abandon war and work together harmoniously under peaceful and mutually helpful conditions.

Consequently, it is imperative that the decisions we make which involve human relationships, both domestic and in the field of international affairs, be made in a climate of cool, rational thinking, rather than under the stress of emotion or under the influence of

attitudes and patterns which we have followed in the past.

The most pressing problem awaiting solution in the world today does not lie in the field of science but in the field of human relationships. We must learn how to live together and work together in this one world at peace.

The primary obstacles to harmonious living in this one world are greed, hate, prejudice, and fear.

As a democracy, we, the people, make the decisions which guide our Nation. The responsibility for the acts of our Nation is ours. We are unshakably opposed to the imperialistic exploitation of human beings. We believe in the education and preparation of colonial peoples for self-government.

We fought this war, not to acquire territory but to insure the integrity of our free institutions, in the belief that, within the framework of our Constitution, we can develop a social pattern which will insure happiness and a decent livelihood for all our citizens.

Our acts must be so designed as to enable us to support without embarrassment these beliefs and these objectives. As a Nation, no action of ours could do more to allay the suspicions of other nations as to our motives than to use our prerogatives as a victorious power to propose that the islands we have conquered in our advance across the Pacific be controlled by an international trusteeship.

Our national security would not be impaired by such a movement because, as a member of the Security Council of the United Nations, we would share in the control and, as the member nation with paramount interest in the Pacific, we would undoubtedly be designated to act as trustee to govern and develop these islands as strategic bases; in fact, we could include such a proviso in our proposal.

Under the provisions for the trusteeship council, as set forth in Chapter 13 of the Charter of the United Nations, we would, as trustees, submit to the council and the council would have authority to send representatives, at times agreed upon with us, to inspect the islands. This procedure would obviate any misunderstanding among other nations as to the motives for which we might be using the bases.

The important point is that the moral effect of this example of our willingness to relinquish something that we have conquered in the interest of peace and mutual understanding would encourage other nations to act in like manner.

My distinguished opponent has argued that these islands were gained at the cost of American blood and treasure and that their sole possession by us is imperative to our national security. My friends, those boys of ours who lie out there under white crosses

and who are the only heroes of this war, fought and died in the belief that we who survive will make this a better world. Their concept of a better world was the assurance of happiness and an abundant life for their loved ones, their children, and their children's children. This goal cannot be attained by a policy of greed and possessiveness which breeds fear and distrust.

As for the question of national security, all the military might and strategy that the human mind can contrive cannot, in the future, provide such security. This can come only from the practice of faith and confidence among peoples and from the application of intelligence and genuine cooperative effort to the problem of satisfying human needs.

We recognized, it is true, when we committed ourselves to participation in the United Nations Organization, that we must be consistent and confirm our faith in the system of international consultation and action by submitting those areas we have gained by conquest to international control. (*Applause.*)

Moderator Denny:

Thank you, Colonel Carlson. Now we turn to the Nation's Capital, to hear from a member of the Naval Affairs Committee, the Honorable Warren Magnuson, Senator from the State of Washington, who will speak to us from

Washington, D. C. Senator Warren Magnuson. (*Applause.*)

Senator Magnuson:

Thank you, Mr. Denny. Some months ago, I, too, returned from the Pacific war convinced of the one weak link in our naval power in the Pacific. At that time, I strenuously urged, as a member of the Naval Affairs Committee of the House, that the conclusion of this war must find us with more strategic Pacific bases. The war is now concluded and I am more firm in that belief than ever. I am glad to note tonight that my colleague, the Honorable Ed. Izac of Southern California, with whom I served many years in the House Naval Affairs Committee, agrees with me in this contention.

However, I must confess that I am puzzled tonight that there is a debate about this matter among our citizens. My guess is that anyone naive enough to tell our fighting men, now coming home from the Pacific, that we should turn over the control of these strategic bases, bases that have been seized by them at a great loss of life and then developed by us with American taxpayer's money, to some kind of international committee would find himself either with a fresh war on his hands or met with that stare of easy skepticism and disbelief which says, "Are you kidding?"

As a matter of fact, I believe, as they, that we should not only

keep what we really need, but we might well even get a few more.

At the outset, let it be clear that no economic considerations are involved in my discussion. This country has no imperialistic designs whatsoever. President Truman made that clear at Potsdam. I agree.

I do not agree with my distinguished previous opponent, Commander Carlson, that the establishment of military bases under our full control in the Pacific would in any way be an imperialistic matter. The question to me is a purely military one and my only purpose in asking for these bases outright is to use them as military bases.

In the light of the bloody lesson we learned in the war just ended one week ago today, the most costly and bloody in all history, we would be completely stupid in our foresight, derelict in our duty to those who died to seize those bases—because they were strategic bases—and surely an utter bunch of supine Milquetoast dreamers if we did not remain adamant in their retention.

Island outposts are the very essentials of the fulfillment of that responsibility.

And lest we forget, what is that responsibility?

First, under our Constitution, this Government is charged with the duty of maintaining the defense of the country proper. Modern

technological and scientific development have expanded that concept far from what it used to be. It is not now limited to our coast lines.

Second, under the Act of Chapultepec and the United Nations Charter, we pledged ourselves to the duty of maintaining peace, not only in North and South America, but in the world, and by force if necessary. The two are not, as Colonel Carlson says, inconsistent, and, assuming this, we must have what it takes to carry out that responsibility—not only tools of faith, as my colleague, George Outland who will appear on this program tonight, usually expresses it—not only tools of faith, but actual physical facilities.

As Admiral King said to me this week, we cannot afford to rely on faith alone for our defense. Should we fail in these responsibilities, the tragic consequences as a hard practical matter will be mainly ours.

No one in this debate or listening in tonight will deny that our first duty, therefore, is to maintain peace in the Pacific. In other words, what happens in the Pacific will affect America more than any other power.

In order to carry out that responsibility and that duty, we must have the tools at our disposal. Pacific bases are those tools, because, regardless of what one noted about the Pacific war from day to day, the conduct of that war was

profoundly influenced at all times by seapower. Seapower remains still the most influential force in the Pacific and will in the future.

The proof of the pudding that we should keep these bases under our control is the fact that we lost more American lives to seize them from the Japs and expended more sums of money to establish them and equip them than any other single war operation. If they were important then, we must assume that they have the same importance in any plans for Pacific peace and world peace.

Therefore, what country having some claim on these islands could object to our having full control for military purposes when, if anything happens, they are going to ask us to assume full responsibility to keep the peace, protect them and their Pacific interests?

Getting down to an international authority, what such authority could object to our full control of these necessary tools when, again, if something happens, they are going to ask us to assume the fight and that responsibility in the Pacific?

We won the Pacific War almost single-handed. We want no more wars anywhere. We know we can prevent that by being big enough and tough enough to discourage anybody or any power with a different idea. We cannot be that big, that tough, nor true to our commitments, unless we can be

sure that every base needed is in our complete control.

Only by keeping full control of these bases can we do what the other countries also affected want us to do. Full control protects other Pacific countries as well as the United States. Any other arrangement would weaken and confuse our ability to do that job for mankind. Trusteeship, with its divided responsibility, is confusion. (*Applause.*)

Moderator Denny:

Thank you, Senator Magnuson. Now we turn to the spokesman of Santa Barbara, the distinguished Californian, Congressman George Outland of Santa Barbara. Congressman Outland. (*Applause.*)

Congressman Outland:

I have very seldom, if ever, disagreed with Congressman Izac and Senator Magnuson. They are both outstanding, progressive Americans. Tonight, however, I must disagree.

The topic which we are discussing goes to the very fundamental of the objectives of this war—security for all nations against the aggression of others. We all agree upon the necessity for such security. We disagree as to whether this security can best be attained through old-time military action, with each nation relying solely upon its own strength, such as Senator Magnuson advocates, or whether we shall attempt to secure

THE SPEAKERS' COLUMN

WARREN GRANT MAGNUSON—Warren G. Magnuson, a Democrat, was elected to Congress from the State of Washington in 1937, at the age of 32. He was born in Moorehead, Minnesota, and attended both the University of North Dakota and North Dakota State College. In 1929 he received his LL.B. degree from the University of Washington and soon after began his law practice. For one year, Congressman Magnuson served as special prosecuting attorney of King County, Washington. Then he was elected to the Washington State Legislature.

After one year in the State Legislature, Congressman Magnuson was appointed assistant U.S. district attorney, and in November, 1934, was elected prosecuting attorney of King County.

GEORGE E. OUTLAND—George Outland was born in Santa Paula, California, in 1906. He received an A.B. degree from Whittier College, an M.A. from Harvard, and a Ph.D. degree in education in government from Yale. He also attended the University of Southern California. From 1928 to 1930, Mr. Outland was assistant director of boys' work at Hale House in Boston, and from 1929 to 1933, director of boys' work at Denison House in the same city. Back in California, he directed Neighborhood House in Los Angeles for a year and was supervisor of boys' welfare for the Federal Transient Service of Southern California for another year. Returning East, he became an instructor at Yale and also director of the New Haven (Connecticut) Community College. From 1937 to 1942, Mr. Outland was on the faculty of Santa Barbara (Calif.) State College. In November, 1942, he was elected Democratic Representative to Congress.

EDOUARD VICTOR MICHEL IZAC—Born in Cresco, Iowa, in 1891, Edouard Izac is a graduate of the U.S. Naval Academy at

Annapolis. In the Navy, he advanced through the grades from ensign in 1915 to lieutenant commander in 1936. During World War I, Congressman Izac was awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor and was decorated by several foreign governments. Because of wounds received as a prisoner of war in Germany, he was forced to retire from active service in 1921. Since that time, he has engaged in newspaper work and writing.

A Democrat, Congressman Izac has been a California member of the House of Representatives since 1937. He is a member of the Naval Affairs Committee.

EVANS FORDYCE CARLSON—Famous as the commanding officer of Carlson's Raiders, the Second Marine raider battalion, Lieutenant Colonel Carlson is one of the most colorful characters to come out of World War II.

Born in Sidney, New York, in 1896, Colonel Carlson entered the U.S. Army at the age of sixteen. He served in the Philippines, Hawaii, and along the Mexican Border. During World War I he served in France and Germany. He was in the assistant adjutant general's department, on the staff of General John J. Pershing and with the Army of Occupation.

After the war, Colonel Carlson returned to civilian life but in 1922 entered the U.S. Marine Corps. He was promoted to a captaincy in 1935, and to lieutenant colonel in 1942. He served in the West Indies with the Battle Fleet, and in Nicaragua. He was an observer with the Chinese armies in 1937 and 1938, even joining Chinese guerilla forces in penetrating behind Japanese lines.

In 1939, Colonel Carlson resigned from the Marines to lecture and write. He reentered in 1941 and became leader of the famous Carlson's Raiders with the rank of Lieutenant Colonel.

Colonel Carlson's books are *Twin Stars of China* and *The Chinese Army*.

it through cooperative international action.

The former has never worked throughout all history. The conflict which has just ended is but the most recent example of that fact. Now, with the coming of the atomic bomb, the reliance

upon armies and navies to preserve the peace seems foolish, indeed.

A new method must be found. The people of the world have been told over and over again that the United Nations fought this war against Fascism with no thought

of territorial aggression. The first principle of the Atlantic Charter declares that this country and Great Britain seek no aggrandizement, territorial or other. At Cairo, in December, 1943, President Roosevelt, Prime Minister Churchill, and Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek repeated this pledge when they stated that their three countries covet no gain for themselves and have no thought of territorial expansion.

I wonder if we, in this country, want to be among the first to violate these solemn pledges. If so, the hope of the peoples of the world for future security and permanent peace is faint indeed.

The time is gone forever when one nation can live in security in the midst of insecurity, when one nation can find peace when there is war on all sides. That is the course of isolationism and one which I am certain all members of this panel tonight repudiate. But the only alternative to isolationism is international cooperation. Such cooperation is not achieved in the abstract.

It is not enough to pay lip service to it. When anyone contends that complete control of any conquered territory should rest in the hands of the conquering country, even if that country happens to be our own, he is following the logical course of isolationism.

Moreover, this course would be exactly what some of us have con-

demned in others. Would we have Russia assume sovereignty over Poland because it was reconquered by the force of Russian arms?

Would we have England annex Belgium because it was British might that was largely instrumental in driving the Nazis out?

Would we, ourselves, advance claims to bases in North Africa on the grounds that it was American blood that made victory possible?

These comparatives, I realize, are not completely accurate, but basically the issue involved is the same. That issue, I repeat, is simply this: Is the United States of America, after spending lavishly of its manpower and its money, to free the world from the spirit of nationalistic aggression, to follow now a course which in many respects would in itself be aggressive and which would most certainly encourage that same spirit of aggression in other nations all over the world?

I am not advocating any Utopian course. I think I realize the importance of these strategic islands in the Pacific and their place in the world of the future. Certainly, the Japanese must be kept out forever. Certainly, these bases must not be permitted to fall into the hands of any other nation.

But other nations do have a stake in their future control. Their security, too, is involved. China,

Australia, New Zealand, Russia, all fought at our side during this war.

It is my contention that these strategic bases should see their ultimate control rest in the World Security Council set up at San Francisco. That council may well allocate the major portion of administration and even control itself to the United States. In such case, that control will have been sanctioned by the other nations and the stain of aggression could never be put upon us.

If, through force alone, we grab and hang on to these bases, then we shall be sowing the seeds of suspicion. We shall encourage other nations to grab what they can and we shall be contributing not to our security but to our future insecurity.

The decision will soon be upon us. I trust that the representatives of the American people will keep faith with those who fought to make this a better world. I trust that our leaders will realize that security for one rests eventually upon security for all.

I trust that the brave words of Mr. Roosevelt will be followed by the brave deeds of Mr. Truman. I trust that the American people will demonstrate that there really is such a thing in the world as Christianity and that might does not make right. (*Applause*.)

We have been granted in our lifetime that which is seldom granted the individuals or nations

—a second chance, second chance to make the world truly safe for democracy and to prevent another world catastrophe.

This time we must not fail. But it will depend in large degree on decisions such as we make in cases like we are discussing here tonight whether we shall fail or whether we shall succeed.

For my part, I want to go squarely on record against isolationism in any form and in favor of genuine international cooperation in action as well as in words. (*Applause*.)

Moderator Denny:

Thank you, Congressman Outland. Now, it's almost time for us to let this Santa Barbara audience in on this discussion so while we get ready for our questions, let's pause briefly for station identification.

Announcer: You are listening to America's Town Meeting, the program that gives both sides of questions vitally important to you, sponsored by the most widely read of all magazines, *The Reader's Digest*.

Tonight, Colonel Evans Carlson, Senator Warren Magnuson, Congressman Ed. V. Izac, and Congressman George Outland clash over the topic "Should We or an International Authority Control Our Strategic Bases in the Pacific?"

For a complete copy of this discussion, including the question period immediately following, send

for the Town Meeting Bulletin. Just write to Town Hall, New York 18, New York, and enclose

ten cents to cover the cost of printing and mailing. And now, Mr. Denny.

QUESTIONS, PLEASE I

Mr. Denny: Now we're ready for the questions from this representative Santa Barbara audience assembled here under the auspices of the Lobero Theater Foundation and Station KTMS. I'm happy to see in the audience so many servicemen from the redistribution station here. I start with the man in uniform right there. Yes?

Man: Congressman Izac. The British had nationally controlled bases. They were not able to enforce peace. Why should our new bases work better than Hongkong and Singapore?

Mr. Denny: Yes, if the British had nationally controlled bases why will our system work any better than Singapore and Hongkong?

Congressman Izac: Because Singapore and Hongkong were about twelve thousand miles away from the country they were presumed to defend. The Pacific Islands are in our front yard. The Pacific is our ocean. It's the only way we can protect the security of the Western Hemisphere—by controlling the islands from which we or our opponents would operate in time of war.

Mr. Denny: Yes. Here's George Outland coming out of his corner. Come on here.

Congressman Outland: I'd just like to comment on that and indirectly on something that Congressman Izac said in his main remarks. He said we mustn't repeat the mistakes of 1918. It seems to me that the mistakes made in 1918 were in not backing up the association of nations which was formed and originated by an American President and giving that association of nations sufficient teeth to prevent aggression in the future—not relying simply on force. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: All right. The gentleman here.

Man: Colonel Carlson.

Mr. Denny: Colonel Carlson. There's a soldier wants to ask you a question.

Man: Sir, in the light of your years of experience in China, how do you think the outcome of events there may affect our security in the Pacific?

Colonel Carlson: I think that's rather irrelevant. China is a coming nation. It's a nation of undeveloped resources, a nation where the standard of living still has to be raised a great deal before it can become a great market for us.

However, China is a nation of four hundred millions of people and she has been at war for over

eight years, which means that the people have developed tremendously during that period. They have learned a good deal about self-government in certain parts. Undoubtedly, China is going to be a great nation and a power and along with the USSR, which has her Far Eastern frontier adjoining, there's going to be a great combination of power out there. How it will affect the situation in the Pacific is problematical, and isn't really pertinent to this discussion.

Mr. Denny: All right. Perhaps that's a topic for another Town Meeting very soon. Here's a question coming up for Senator Magnuson. Yes?

Man: Would not our controls of the bases be provocative of war with Russia or a race war, and would not such war be suicidal for America?

Mr. Denny: Senator Magnuson in Washington.

Senator Magnuson: Thank you, Mr. Denny. I heard the question and I agree, of course, that a race war would be suicidal. I think we're proceeding here on the wrong assumption. I haven't heard anything from the other countries in the Pacific that they'd object to our full control of strategic bases. As a matter of fact, it's the exact opposite.

Australia approves of it—approved of the Izac report the other day. New Zealand has offered us bases outright. The Philippines

asked us to have bases. I don't know what Russia's position is on it, but I think that this country, Russia, shouldn't object to us having strategic bases in the Pacific when she wants also some strategic bases in parts of Europe. If they're necessary for the defense of her country or to help us maintain this United Nations Charter, that we are talking about tonight, why I think any country who is helping maintain the peace of the world ought to be entitled to those tools wherever they are.

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Senator Magnuson.

Lady: Congressman Outland, please. To what extent, by our signature of the charter, are we already pledged to the principle of trusteeship?

Congressman Outland: It seems to me that that's a fundamental question and we are pledged and the fact that our Senate has ratified it means that the American people this time are going to go on record against such aggression. Now whether it be the case, as Congressman Izac said, of three kings down in the Marshalls coming and asking the United States to take over, I don't think that's the issue. As a matter of fact, I wish I had the opportunity to see three kings once. I haven't seen three kings at one time for an awful long time.

Mr. Denny: You don't play enough gin rummy.

Senator Magnuson: May I disagree with my colleague, Congressman Outland, on this matter? I don't think that by signing the United Nations Charter, and I am sure the United States Senate didn't have that impression, that we agreed to trusteeship only in such places where there might be some economic consideration. Military bases and strategic bases for this country were left wide open and the problem is still to be presented to the United Nations. As a matter of fact, they probably will tell us to take full control so that we can carry out the principles of that Charter.

Mr. Denny: It's even possible for Senators to misunderstand. At least not to agree with Congressmen. Here's a question coming up for you, Senator Magnuson.

Lady: Senator Magnuson. How could we have a voice in trust areas elsewhere in the world if we keep full control in the Pacific?

Senator Magnuson: We have the same voice that any other signatory to the Charter has on trusteeships all over the world. Other countries will have a voice on this question. I merely pointed out a while ago that those Pacific countries want us, insofar as I can ascertain, to have full control.

Mr. Denny: Thank you. The gentleman right here, please.

Man: Congressman Outland, if you knew that Great Britain or some other country than the United

States were to be the trustee, would you still feel that you favored trusteeship?

Congressman Outland: I feel that you can't favor the principle of trusteeship if it's applicable only to one country. It seems to me, as I said a moment ago, if we are going to attain security for one nation we've got to attain it by granting security for all. If the United Nations would grant Great Britain the trusteeship over a particular territory, Russia over a particular territory, China over a particular territory, and the United States, my answer would be the same.

Then the control would be derived from international cooperation. It's the source of that control rather than the control itself that seems to me to be so important. We've got only one alternative to force and that is international cooperation and some day international law. I think the latter should be equally applicable to all nations. (*Applause.*)

Senator Magnuson: Mr. Denny, I assume that when we're talking here that if we asked for full control, it would be passed on by the trusteeship council. I thought this argument tonight was whether or not we should assume full control—not whether or not we should abide by the United Nations trusteeship council.

Mr. Denny: All right. Congressman Outland?

Congressman Outland: Senator Magnuson, there was one thing in Mr. Denny's opening remarks and I copied it down very carefully at the time. He said the issue was going to be "full title vs. trusteeship." Those are the words he used and so far as trusteeship is concerned, yes, I'll be glad to go along with you. Full title, no, because that means in the long run aggressive control.

Senator Magnuson: I'm glad we agree.

Mr. Denny: All right. Next question, please. The gentleman back there.

Man: Congressman Izac. Would you be willing to cede our Pacific bases to the international authority control if the other Allied Nations were equally willing to cede their strategic bases of control on the same basis?

Congressman Izac: No, I would not, because Latvia, Lithuania, and those other territories near Russia are her business more than they are ours. I don't see how we could do them any good because we don't talk the language and we don't think the same way. Why they shouldn't have some determination of the areas in their front yard the same as we ask for ourselves in the Pacific is more than I can understand because the life of nations depends on that.

Nobody else comes to your rescue when you're down and out—it's your own people, and our

own people have to make the United States secure for the future. We're not going to get it from any altruistic Britain, or Russia, or China, or anybody else, I'm sorry to say. That's why I contend that we must keep within our own grasp the power to work out our own peaceful destiny.

You can't tell me that Mr. Hitler with the atomic bomb, having listened to all of this San Francisco Conference, would have turned around and said, "Yes, they're right. I guess I'd better just throw this in the ocean some place." We tried that experiment, you remember, about neutrality. It was a noble experiment but we tried it alone. You can't do it alone. If all the other nations accept, then it might work. But they never accept because there is always somebody who hasn't as much as somebody else and the greed of nations asserts itself finally. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Congressman Izac. We have an overflow audience here in the Lobero Theater. Here is a Sergeant way back on the stage. If you'll turn the microphone around there to pick him up, please.

Man: Senator Magnuson, are you willing that Russia shall have the same opportunities to permanently occupy the Kuriles, Port Arthur, or Manchuria, as strategic bases?

Senator Magnuson: No, because

I don't think they are strategic to Russia.

Mr. Denny: All right. Thank you. The Marine there in the back who has a question for Colonel Carlson.

Man: Colonel Carlson, do you think that the United Nations setup is now prepared to assume responsibility for the islands in question? How soon should the islands be released by us?

Colonel Carlson: No, the United Nations setup as such is not prepared to take over at the time. The procedure as I understand it would be for the United Nations organization to designate a trustee for the islands of the Pacific and it is logical to believe that the United States would be designated as the trustee and, as I pointed out in my initial presentation, we could include that as a proviso.

We are prepared to take over as trustee or with full title, as the people of the United States determine. My feeling is that we should take over as a trustee, because under the trusteeship the other members of the United Nations, through the Security Council—through the international trusteeship—would be able to send representatives to inspect the islands and to determine what use we were making of them, which would allay suspicion, and so on.

Man: Congressman Izac, since the atomic bomb has made world government an urgent necessity,

can we not take a useful first step toward world government by internationalizing these islands?

Congressman Izac: I don't put as much faith in the atomic bomb as some people do because, you remember, we have had lots of good bombs in the past and it took an awful lot of suffering and death to get that bomb or those bombs where we wanted them.

In other words, simply because you have an atomic bomb doesn't mean that you're going to revolutionize the whole world. You have to get that bomb some place where it does somebody ill or somebody good.

Now, as for the other part of your question, the internationalizing of these islands won't add to our security any. It will be another noble experiment, if you want. Yes, I'll go along on that. But in the long run, some demagogue will rise in Germany or Japan or maybe, in the future, some country that isn't now even on the face of the earth, and he will gather behind him the masses of the people because that great American nation has all the assets and all the resources and "we, poor we, have nothing." The people rise up as they did behind Hitler and say, "That's right, we've got to do something and we have to take our place in the sun."

What does the internationalizing of these islands mean in a situation like that? It means that un-

less the United States defends them they are not defended, because in the long run nobody else is ever able to. We have the resources, we have the democracy, that is sufficient above all other things to keep us on the straight and narrow path. We'll win that way. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Senator Izac. You've made Mr. Outland uncomfortable. He's up again.

Congressman Outland: I'd like to comment just briefly on that. I think, perhaps, we are getting a little bit away from the main issue. The issue is not whether we are internationalizing islands or not. It's where the source of control is going to come from—whether it's going to come from the force of aggression, from the might alone of one nation, or whether that nation may be asked by the United Nations to take charge and administer them. That, I think, is the point we've got to decide.

Mr. Denny: Just a minute, Congressman, while you're on your feet there. Here's a question for you and the Senator, Senator Magnuson. Doesn't it make a lot of difference—I'm asking this for someone who raised it to me before the broadcast—whether these islands are administered militarily from the viewpoint of a world organization or from the viewpoint of America itself, a single nation—let's take it abstractly—a single nation or a world organization—

in defense of one nation or internationally as described in the Charter, portions of which I read at the outset? Senator Magnuson, will you comment on that?

Senator Magnuson: Mr. Denny, I assume that we would use these islands even if we had full control of them, use the military strategicness of the islands for the purpose of the United Nations. To me, full control means a better insurance for peace than it would be to have a trusteeship council or some divided responsibility. Why, of course, we're not going to use them only for our own defense. We're going to use them to maintain peace in the Pacific under the blueprint and under the commitments we made in the United Nations Charter.

Mr. Denny: Well, that makes the issue very clear. Congressman Outland?

Congressman Outland: I think I would agree with a portion of that, but I do want to say this. The basic reason that the League of Nations failed after the last war was because it didn't have the power and the authority to enforce its dictates. The principal thing needed for an international organization, call it United Nations or anything else, to win is to have the proper amount of authority. Call it, if you wish, international police, and if the moment you start on the issue that one country is going to keep the peace, or this

country is going to keep the peace, or some other country is going to keep the peace, on its own, without that authority having been granted from the international group, then you're going right squarely back to the old issue of balance of power of one country against another. It's never produced peace in all the history of the world. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you. Colonel Carlson has a comment on that.

Colonel Carlson: I agree wholly with Congressman Outland in that prediction. We haven't made very much progress in the last 25 or 26 years, since the last war, if we're going right back into the old attitudes and the old patterns which prevailed before that time. These attitudes and patterns which have taken the form of balances of power, and so on, simply lead to another war.

We've got to begin to give as individuals and as nations rather than seek to take, if we are going to work out this problem of harmonizing human relationships and harmonizing the relationships between nations, which are simply large groups of people.

Senator Magnuson: Mr. Denny, may I answer Colonel Carlson?

Mr. Denny: Yes, sir.

Senator Magnuson: I must assume that we're not going to abuse any power that we have in the Pacific. The only purpose of the power is to keep some aggressor

from abusing us and other democratic nations.

Mr. Denny: All right. In other words, we're going to be the big policeman.

Senator Magnuson: We always have been, for the world, and I guess we'll have to continue to be to keep peace in the world. It's a difficult job sometimes. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Now you want to get that clear. Mr. Izac has a comment on that.

Congressman Izac: Well, I think it's obvious that where these territories lie in one's immediate strategic domain nobody else is going to defend them like that nation itself. What would happen if the internationalists, or this international body, should decide we weren't doing a good job in some of these bases that they had assigned to us, and they'd want to take them back? Wouldn't that be a fine mess for us to get into, if we find our whole frontier, our Pacific frontier denuded of fortifications and of strength of all kinds? We would lie completely exposed to the attack from the mass populations of the world—a billion and a half of them in the Asiatic continent.

I contend that, of course, the Allied Nations must see the light and must give us control of these strategic bases that mean so much to us just as they're doing the same thing for Russia and for England and for all the other countries.

That doesn't mean the exploitation of the peoples in those countries, but it does mean the safeguarding and the protection of the security of the peoples within those countries. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Congressman Izac. Congressman Outland has a comment.

Congressman Outland: There are two very brief comments that I want to make. We get the islands to protect bases and then we get islands to protect the islands to protect the bases, and then we get the islands to protect the islands. Just how far, as a point of policy is that supposed to go? That's point number one.

Point number two, and I'd like to ask this to you, Maggie (*laughter*) — Senator Magnuson back in Washington. The implication has been that we're taking these bases because of an enemy in the Pacific. Just which country in the Pacific is it that you think may be a potential enemy?

Mr. Denny: Now that's a pretty tough question.

Senator Magnuson: I might say, Congressman Outland, to my colleague, I don't know what country is going to be a potential enemy. I'm more concerned with being sure that whatever country might become in the future, that America will be properly defended and properly protected, because when America is defended and protected,

why the whole Pacific peace is defended and protected.

Mr. Denny: All right. Thank you.

Man: Senator Magnuson. Aren't you and Mr. Outland and Colonel Carlson really very much on the same side, and leaving your colleague on the other side? (*Laughter.*)

Mr. Denny: Colonel Carlson's up here for a comment on that.

Colonel Carlson: I don't want to comment on that, I want to comment on Congressman Izac's concern for the peace of the Pacific and for the possession of the Pacific Islands out there. It seems to me that if we are appointed the trustee for those islands in the Pacific and we are actually in occupation, if some of the other nations of the United Nations suddenly decide that they don't want us in occupation, we are still in possession. This is like an argument between—

Senator Magnuson: Then we'd have another war on our hands. (*Laughter and applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Colonel Carlson and Senator Magnuson—that was a terrible note to end on—Congressman Izac, and George Outland.

Well, this question, friends, is going to be squarely up to Congress when it reconvenes September 4, so we'd better do some pretty straight thinking about it between now and then. The same thing is

true of our topic for next week, which is certainly the number one domestic problem before us. Before we tell you about that, here's an important message for you.

Announcer: An article in the September issue of *The Reader's Digest* quotes the following words of Herbert Hoover: "It's 11:59 on Europe's starvation clock. To help feed Europe's hungry is more than good neighborliness, it's our own interest to hurry food to a starving Europe that may be breeding grounds for social unrest and possible chaos. Not only food but enormous quantities of medical supplies must continue to be shipped to Europeans and other liberated areas."

The packing of these vital necessities requires tin. Tin cans are not only needed for an amazing variety of rehabilitation uses but to make up the equipment of our own servicemen still stationed in occupied areas. Tin encases the emergency sulfa ointments that protect against infection. Tin seals canned foods against the humidity of the Pacific climate. Even though the war is over today, there is an urgent need for more tin supplies.

The solution to the tin crisis lies in the increased salvage of household tin cans. The housewife alone can make it possible to beat the critical tin shortage.

Save all the tin cans and prepare them properly for salvage. Remove all labels and wash the cans thoroughly. Each housewife must make it her own personal responsibility to see that the cans she saves reaches her local salvage depot. If you have any question about tin can collections in your community, check with your local salvage committee. Now, *The Reader's Digest* returns you to Mr. Denny.

Mr. Denny: Now that peace has come, all America is talking about reconversion. Reconversion of the productive forces of America to useful peacetime goods and services—jobs for all who want to work.

So next week from Pasadena, California, our topic will be "How Can We Make Jobs for All Now?"

Our speakers will be the former president of the War Production Board, now president of the Independent Motion Picture Producers Association, Mr. Donald Nelson; a member of the Senate Committee on Reconversion Problems, Senator Hugh B. Mitchell, of Washington; the director of the War Policy Division of the United Automobile Workers, CIO, Victor G. Reuther, and a fourth speaker to be announced.

Announcer: Be sure to tune in next week when *The Reader's Digest* brings you Town Meeting.



Town Meeting Bulletin

ISSUES NOW IN STOCK

Order by number from the list below while they last—

VOLUME 10

35. Should All Germans Be Punished for Nazi Crimes and Atrocities?
36. Should We Support Russia's Plans for Poland?
37. Is Communism a Threat to the American Way of Life?
38. What Should Be America's War and Peace Aims?
39. Do We Want Universal Military Training for Youth?
40. Should Congress Pass a Work or Fight Bill?
42. Results of the Big Three Conference.
45. Can France Regain Her Place as a World Power?
46. How Should We Deal With a Defeated Japan?
49. Are Britain and America Headed for a Trade War After Victory?
50. Are the Rights of the Small Nations Protected Under Dumbarton Oaks?
51. Can We Build a Lasting Peace Now?

VOLUME 11

1. Is War Impairing Our Moral Standards?

2. What Next in Europe?
3. Are National Planning and Government Control a Threat to Democracy?
4. Are We Solving America's Race Problem?
5. Russia and America—Postwar Rivals or Allies?
6. Should the Lid Be Kept On Prices During Postwar Reconversion?
8. Should the Big 5 Veto Power Be Included in the World Charter?
9. Should We Accept the San Francisco Charter?
10. Should We Have Universal Military Training After the War?
11. Should the Government Be Responsible for Continuing Full Employment?
12. Should Congress Provide Health and Old Age Insurance for All?
13. Should War Veterans Have Job Preference?
14. How Can Russia and America Live in Peace?
15. What Does the British Election Mean to Us?
16. Will the Returning Soldier Be a Problem?

Order single copies at 10c each from TOWN HALL, INC.,
123 West 43rd St., New York 18, N. Y.

Any Twenty-six Issues of Town Meeting Bulletin Will Be Sent at This Special Low Subscription Rate: Any 26 Weeks Only
\$2.35
Single Copies 10c